



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to, namely, to take as dew-point, the mean of the temperatures indicated by the inner thermometer at the instant of the deposition of the dew, and at that of its disappearance, the result is necessarily higher than the truth.

Dr. Apjohn concluded, by drawing attention to the great value of the other tables alluded to in Captain Boileau's letter, the construction of which, must have been a work of immense labour. Two of these greatly simplify the calculations necessary in applying the hygrometric formula, as the arithmetical operations are thereby reduced to mere addition and subtraction.

The third table gives the force of vapour to tenths of a degree Fahrenheit, throughout the entire range included between -3° and $+146$, Fahrenheit, calculated *de novo* by the well known method of Biot, from the experiments of Dalton and Ure. It does not materially differ, except in its greater extent and minuteness, from the table of the tension of aqueous vapour which Dr. Apjohn has hitherto used, and the superior accuracy of which, as compared with the table of Kaemtz, and that not long since published by the Meteorological Committee of the Royal Society, has been rendered highly probable by Professor Lloyd.

Professor Mac Cullagh read a paper on the Catalogue of Egyptian Kings, which is usually known by the name of the *Laterculum* of Eratosthenes.

This Catalogue, which the distinguished mathematician and philosopher whose name it bears drew up by command of Ptolemy Euergetes, contains a long series of kings who reigned at Thebes in Upper Egypt; and has been preserved to us in the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus, a Greek monk of the eighth century. It is a document which has been made much use of by chronologers; by some of whom, as by Sir John Marsham for example, who calls it "*venerandissimum antiquitatis monumentum*," it has been reckoned of the very highest authority; but it is extremely

corrupt in the latter part, owing to the carelessness with which it was transcribed either by Syncellus himself or his immediate copyists. The writers on Egyptian antiquities have in consequence been much perplexed in settling the chronology of the reigns in which the errors exist, and the attempts that have been made to remove the confusion have only served to increase it. It was the object of the author to restore the document to its original state, and he showed that this might be effected, with complete certainty, by a proper attention to the manuscripts of Syncellus. Of these only two are known; one has been used by Father Goar, the first editor of the *Chronographia* (Paris, 1652); the other, which is a much better one, has been collated by Dindorf, the second and latest editor. Dindorf's edition was published at Bonn, in the year 1829, as part of the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ*, and on its first appearance Mr. Mac Cullagh had satisfied himself as to the original readings of the Catalogue, and had seen how to account for the errors which, probably from Syncellus's own negligence, had crept into it; but he did not publish his conclusions at the time, thinking that similar considerations could not fail to occur to some of the numerous writers who were then giving their especial attention to such subjects. This, however, has not been the case. Chronologers have continued to follow in the footsteps of Goar, a man of little learning, and of no critical sagacity, who corrected the Catalogue most injudiciously, and whose corrections, strange to say, are left without any remark by Dindorf. Thus Mr. Cory, in his *Ancient Fragments*, a work much referred to, merely transcribes Goar's list; and Mr. Cullimore, in attempting to reconcile ancient authors with each other and with the monuments, has adopted an hypothesis respecting the identity of two sovereigns, which is not tenable when the true version of the Catalogue is known. Even in Goar's edition, however, there was quite enough to have led a person of ordinary judgment to the

correct readings of the Catalogue, though perhaps they could not be said to be absolutely certain without the additional light obtained from that of Dindorf.

The Catalogue in question professes to contain the names of thirty-eight sovereigns, with the years of their reigns; the whole succession occupying, as is stated, a period of 1076 years; but it is only in the last eight reigns that the errors and inconsistencies occur. The thirty-second prince is called Stamenemes β , that is, Stamenemes the Second, though there is, at present, no other of that name in the list; and the beginning of his reign—as appears from the years of the world, which Syncellus has annexed according to the Constantinopolitan reckoning—follows the termination of the preceding one by an interval of twenty-six years. Jackson, in his *Chronological Antiquities*, is positive that this prince is called the Second by a mistake, and adds the years that are wanting to the reign of his predecessor, as Goar had previously done. In the first part of this view all authors, without exception, are agreed, though they do not explain how a mistake, so very odd, could have originated; but the learned Marsham,—who, having adopted the short chronology of the Hebrew Bible, is so hard pressed to find room for the Egyptian dynasties that he is obliged to begin the reign of Menes the very year after the Deluge,—is glad to omit the twenty-six years altogether, thus reducing the sum of all the reigns to 1050 years, contrary to what is expressly stated by Syncellus. The natural inference from the state of the MSS. is, however, simply this: that the thirty-second king was Stamenemes I., that he reigned twenty-six years, and was succeeded by Stamenemes II. We may easily conceive that the eye of the transcriber, deceived by the identity of names, passed over the first, and rested on the second, thus occasioning the error. Indeed there can now be no doubt that this was the fact; because, in the MS. marked (B) by Dindorf, the next king is numbered as the thirty-fourth, the next but

one as the thirty-fifth, and so on; which shows that a name had dropped out, and this name could be no other than that of Stamenemes I., who must have filled the vacant interval, and must consequently have reigned the number of years that has been assigned to him.

As neither Goar nor any other writer perceived this omission, the successor of Stamenemes II. has always been reckoned as the thirty-third in the list, and the next following as the thirty-fourth, &c. But as one error begets another, the omission was compensated by the insertion of an anonymous king, who is placed thirty-sixth in the list, with a reign of fourteen years; the insertion being necessary to complete the number (thirty-eight) which the Catalogue ought to contain. And, by a further error, these fourteen years are taken out of the reign of the thirty-seventh sovereign, who ought to have nineteen years instead of the five that have been hitherto assigned to him. This last error was occasioned by an ignorant correction of a mistake which is found in both the MSS., and which therefore probably arose from the carelessness of Syncellus himself. The thirty-seventh king and his predecessor are stated to have begun to reign in the same year of the world, and to have reigned the same number of years (five). Now from what goes before it is plain that both these numbers belong to the thirty-sixth king; and from the year of the world in which the thirty-eighth and last king began to reign, it is clear that the thirty-seventh reigned nineteen years. The mistake in the MSS. is one which might easily be made by a thoughtless writer; for the Catalogue is given in detached portions—a few reigns at a time—separated by a great quantity of other matter, and the name of the thirty-sixth king ends one of these portions, while that of the thirty-seventh begins another; so that, not having both before his eyes at the same moment, a person so careless as Syncellus might, without being conscious of it, attach the same reign and date to the two names, by tran-

scribing twice over the same line of numbers in the Catalogue which he was copying; the whole of which Catalogue, in all likelihood, he had previously drawn up in a tabular form, with the years of the world annexed according to his own chronology, that it might be ready, as any portion of it was wanted, for immediate transference to his pages. Such seems to be the natural account of the matter; but, as usual, it does not occur to Goar, who takes the opportunity, which the confusion affords him, of foisting in his supplementary king between the two last mentioned, giving each of these five years, as in the MS., by which means he obtains room for him, while on the other hand he alters the year of the world attached to the thirty-seventh king, so as to make it suit his hypothesis.

The following is a view of the last eight reigns, as they appear to have stood in the original document, compared with the erroneous list of Goar. The years of the world are omitted, as being of no importance, except so far as they are useful in the preceding argument.

I. GOAR'S LIST.		II. CORRECTED LIST.	
	Years.		Years.
31. <i>Peteathyres</i>	reigned 42	31. <i>Peteathyres</i>	reigned 16
32. <i>Stamenemes</i>	„ 23	32. <i>Stamenemes</i> I.	„ 26
33. <i>Sistosichermes</i>	„ 55	33. <i>Stamenemes</i> II.	„ 23
34. <i>Maris</i>	„ 43	34. <i>Sistosichermes</i>	„ 55
35. <i>Siphoas</i>	„ 5	35. <i>Maris</i>	„ 43
36. Anonymous	„ 14	36. <i>Siphoas</i>	„ 5
37. <i>Phruoro</i>	„ 5	37. <i>Phruoro</i>	„ 19
38. <i>Amuthartæus</i>	„ 63	38. <i>Amuthartæus</i>	„ 63

The interval of time which has been shown to belong to the first *Stamenemes*, and which was added by Goar to the reign of *Peteathyres*, is differently disposed of by Mr. Culimore, in a chronological table which he has given in the second volume of the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. His object being to compare the lists of Eratos-

thenes, Manetho, &c., with the supposed hieroglyphical series, he makes Saophis, the fifteenth in Eratosthenes' Catalogue, the same as a king whose name is read Phrathek Osirtesen; but the forty-third year of the latter is mentioned on the monuments, whereas Saophis has only twenty-nine years in the Catalogue. To escape from this difficulty, therefore, Mr. Cullimore adds the unappropriated interval to the reign of Saophis, thus giving him fifty-five years instead of twenty-nine. But it now appears that such a supposition is altogether inadmissible, and consequently the two personages in question cannot be identified; a circumstance which proves that there is some fault in Mr. Cullimore's assumptions, and that his other conclusions, at least in this part of his table, cannot be relied on.

The corrections here given do not interfere with the inferences drawn by Professor Mac Cullagh from the Catalogue of Eratosthenes in a former paper on Egyptian Chronology (*Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, vol. i. p. 66), because the portion of the Catalogue with which he was there concerned terminates with the reign of Queen Nitocris, the twenty-second in the list. The corrections, indeed, though not hitherto published, were made long before the date (April, 1837) of that paper, but not before he had adopted the hypothesis therein proposed, as an answer to the old and ever-recurring question—Who were the Egyptian sovereigns that were contemporary with Moses? For it was in consequence of this hypothesis, which had suggested itself to him at a very early period, that he was led to examine the Catalogue minutely, in order to discover whether his chronology was affected by its errors.

Having been led to refer to his hypothesis, Mr. Mac Cullagh took occasion to observe that, in the interval which had elapsed since it was published, he had not met with any facts that were opposed to it: on the contrary, the more he considered it, the more he was inclined to believe in its

reality; though it was entirely different from every other that had been proposed, either by modern chronologers or by the early Fathers of the Church, in their manifold attempts to connect the narrative of Moses with the remaining fragments of Egyptian history. The hypothesis, indeed, is the *only* one which, while it gives a probable date for the Exodus, also satisfies what Mr. Mac Cullagh conceives to be the necessary conditions of the question; namely, a very long reign—of at least eighty years—during which the Israelites were persecuted, succeeded by a very short one—apparently not more than a year—during which their deliverance was wrought; and it is interesting in itself, on account of the remarkable connexion which it establishes between sacred and profane history, and the highly dramatic character of the events which are thus, for the first time, brought into view.

Mr. Petrie exhibited a drawing, on a large scale, of an ancient inscribed grave stone at Clonmacnoise, which he considered as interesting, not only as a characteristic example of the usual sepulchral memorials of the Irish, from the sixth to the twelfth century,—and of which Mr. Petrie has collected upwards of three hundred examples,—but also as a monumental record of a person very eminently distinguished for his learning in Ireland in the ninth century.

This stone, which is about four feet in length, and three in breadth, though never squared or dressed, exhibits a very richly carved cross, and the following simple inscription:

SVIBHNE. [̄]m maizæ hvmαι.

SUIBHNE, THE SON OF MAILÆHUMAI.

Of the celebrity, in his day, of the person who is thus recorded, the Irish Annals, as well as those of England and Wales, bear abundant evidence.

In the *Chronicon Scotorum* his death is thus recorded